

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 were pending in this application, and are the subject of a restriction requirement. Claims 48-50 have been added by this amendment as indicated above. A replacement specification has been submitted as attached. Claims 1-50 are now pending in this application, are subject to a restriction requirement, and are at issue herein.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement in view of the following remarks and examination of the Application are respectfully solicited.

The Examiner has requested the Applicants' cooperation in correcting any errors of which the Applicants may be aware in the Specification. The Applicants have complied with the Examiner's request and have submitted herewith a substitute Specification correcting various errors, providing definitions for the acronyms used therein, identifying the co-pending applications relevant to the Specification, etc. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The Examiner has issued a restriction requirement between the claims of Group I (claims 1-45), Group II (claim 46), and Group III (claim 47). In response to this requirement for restriction, the Applicants respectfully elect with traverse the claims of Group I (claims 1-45). Reconsideration of this restriction requirement and examination of all claims currently pending in a single application are respectfully solicited.

In support of the requirement for restriction, the Office has taken the position that the claims of Groups I, II, and III are disclosed as different combinations which are not connected in design, operation, or effect. In explaining this statement the Office has done nothing more than list the preambles and claim limitations from independent claims 1, 46, and 47. However, unlike the example given in M.P.E.P. § 806.04 of an article of apparel such as a shoe and a locomotive bearing, or a process of painting a house and a process of boring a well, the claims of the identified groups are not so easily distinguished. Indeed, the Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not independent as being directed to different combinations not disclosed as capable of use together, having different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects.

The Specification clearly describes such interrelationships to dispute the Office's conclusory statement that they are independent. Indeed, the claim elements themselves belie the Office's contention that they are independent. For example, independent claim 46 requires, *inter alia*, the selecting of a particular element on a user interface, the requesting of a definition of the class from the management framework, and the returning of the class definition to the user interface. Similarly, independent claim 47 requires, *inter alia*, displaying a list of elements available for management in one pane of a display, and

displaying data relating to the active index item in another of the panes of the display upon selection of one of the elements of the list. As will be apparent to those skilled in the art, these claims are but different definitions of the same disclosed subject matter, varying in breadth or scope of definition, but not otherwise independent. See M.P.E.P. § 806.03. This may also be seen when comparing the limitations of independent claims 33-45 to the limitations of claim 46. Each of these claims deals with a class definition, one from the requesting side, and one from the generation side of the process. Specifically, claim 46 requires, *inter alia*, requesting a definition of the class from the management network, while claim 33 requires, *inter alia*, the provider providing a class definition. Further, claim 46 requires the step of creating an instance of the element, while claim 33 requires generating an instance of the class to which the element belongs. This clearly demonstrates that the Office's contention of independent inventions requiring restriction is not well-founded. As such, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the requirement for restriction and examination of claims 1-47 in a single application. Further, newly added claims 48 and 49 are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. As such, the Applicants respectfully seek their examination in a single application as well.

With regard to newly added independent claim 50, the Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is also properly presented in this application as the invention claimed thereby is neither independent nor distinct from the inventions claimed in the preceding 49 claims. Instead, this claim provides but a different definition of the same disclosed subject matter, varying in breadth or scope of definition in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 806.03. Specifically, this claim requires, *inter alia*, providing a standard interface to allow management of an element via the user interface, and dynamically localizing the user interface based on language preference information. Such dynamic localization is also claimed, for example, in claims 11-13, 24-25, etc. As such, examination of newly added claim 50 in this application is respectfully solicited.

In re Appln. of Kumbalimutt et al.
Application No. 09/502,689

Conclusion

In view of the above the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-50 are properly presented in a single application, and respectfully solicit examination thereof.

Reconsideration of the requirement for restriction, examination of all claims in a single application, and an indication of the allowability of claims 1-50 at an early date are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephonic conversation will aid in the resolution of any issues not resolve herein, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffery J. Makeever, Reg. No. 37390
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
6815 Weaver Road, Suite 300
Rockford, Illinois 61114-8018
(815) 963-7661 (telephone)
(815) 963-7664 (facsimile)

Date: February 28, 2003

In re Appln. of Kumbalimutt et al.
Application No. 09/502,689

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION (along with any documents referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date: February 28, 2003

Linda Sorenson